

## DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1-30 are pending. Claim 1 is amended.

### *Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

The Examiner stated that claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6437818 to Ludwig et al., (hereinafter “Ludwig”), and further in view of U.S. Patent. No. 7334017 to Hawkes, Rycharde Jeffery et al., (hereinafter “Hawkes”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the reasons stated below.

Applicant claims in currently amended claim 1:

(Currently amended) A multimedia collaboration system for facilitating a multimedia collaboration session between a plurality of participants, comprising a plurality of client devices associated with each of the plurality of participants, each of the plurality of client devices configured to store endpoint address information associated with ~~the~~ an associated participant, the multimedia collaboration system configured to:

automatically obtain the endpoint address information from each of the plurality of client devices;

associate a plurality of endpoint addresses associated with a participant of the plurality of participants with a network and with a media type, wherein the endpoint address is any end point that can communicate including a website, a session initiation protocol telephone, a telephone, a cellular telephone, a personal digital assistant, and any other type of media component that can communicate;

select ~~an~~ appropriate endpoint addresses of one or more endpoints from the participant's client device based on a type of request, the network and the media type, the endpoint addresses being assigned priorities; and

automatically attempt to connect to at least one client device and the an associated  
endpoint at an end point address based on the priority assigned to the end point;

wherein the automatically ~~obtained~~ obtaining endpoint address information and  
the associated plurality of endpoint addresses is performed in at least one of:  
parallel, sequentially and simultaneously for one or more participants in the  
collaboration system.

The independent claim 1 (as amended) requires the limitations “*select appropriate endpoint addresses of one or more endpoints from the participant’s client device based on a type of request, the network and the media type, the endpoint addresses being assigned priorities*” and “*automatically attempt to connect to at least one client device and an associated endpoint at an end point address based on the priority assigned to the end point*”. Each of the dependent claims 2-30 properly depend (directly or indirectly) from the independent claim 1, and therefore require these limitations. Upon review of Ludwig and Hawkes, the Applicant respectfully submits that neither Ludwig nor Hawkes discloses a system involving the above claim elements.

The examiner has relied upon the same portion of Ludwig (col. 19, ln 28-38) to disclose claim elements “*automatically obtain the endpoint address information from each of the plurality of client devices*” and “*select appropriate endpoint addresses of one or more endpoints from the participant’s client device based on a type of request, the network and the media type*”. In col. 19, ln 28-38 Ludwig discloses:

“Once the user selects the desired participant and session type, Collaboration Initiator module 161 retrieves necessary addressing information from Directory Service 66 (See FIG. 21)...”

The applicant respectfully submits that “*automatically obtain the endpoint address information from each of the plurality of client devices*” and “*select appropriate endpoint addresses of one or more endpoints from the participant’s client device based on a type of request, the network and the media type*” are two separate steps and cannot be disclosed by the single function of “retrieving addressing information from Directory

Service” as disclosed by Ludwig. The instant application discloses that the endpoint address information obtained from each of the client devices includes endpoint addresses of one or more endpoints associated to the client device. The step of selecting appropriate addresses includes selecting endpoint addresses, from the endpoint address information, of similar endpoints based on the nature of request, the network and the media type. For example, for a collaboration session involving teleconferencing, the endpoint address information of a requesting client device, among other information, may include endpoint addresses of one or more teleconferencing devices such as a mobile phone, a fixed line phone and the like. The selecting step, in this case, may include selecting the endpoint addresses of all the teleconferencing devices associated to the requesting client device. In addition, Ludwig does not disclose selecting of endpoint addresses each of which are assigned priorities.

With regards to Hawkes, although Hawkes discloses a web interaction system which allows considerable flexibility in how a request from a user to communicate with one or more other participants is satisfied based on the user’s devices capabilities, preference, priority and network topology, it does not disclose the specific step of selecting appropriate endpoint addresses from the automatically obtained endpoint address information as discussed above. Furthermore, Hawkes does not disclose any endpoint addresses that are assigned priorities.

Thus neither Ludwig nor Hawkes disclose *“select appropriate endpoint addresses of one or more endpoints from the participant’s client device based on a type of request, the network and the media type, the endpoint addresses being assigned priorities”*.

With regard to the amended claim element *“automatically attempt to connect to at least one client device and an associated endpoint at an end point address based on the priority assigned to the end point”*, the paragraphs and drawings cited by the Examiner do not disclose this claim element. Hawkes discloses:

“Depending on the nature of the service, upon the requesting party joining the selected session, one or more further participants can be automatically invited into

the session by the service instance 26 on the basis of the information contained in the initiation context 40 the current state of the selected session, and the nature of the service concerned.”

Although Hawkes discloses automatically inviting participants to the session, it does not disclose automatically connecting to the end points based on a priority assigned to them. In the instant application, continuing the teleconferencing example, once the endpoint addresses of the endpoints (mobile phone, fixed line phone etc.) have been selected, an attempt is made to connect to the end points based on the priorities assigned to them. If a participant has set a higher priority to the mobile phone, an attempt will first be made to connect to the mobile phone. An attempt to connect to the fixed line phone may be made only if the connection with the mobile phone is unsuccessful. Thus, neither Ludwig nor Hawkes disclose *“automatically attempt to connect to at least one client device and an associated endpoint at an end point address based on the priority assigned to the end point”*.

Thus, Applicant respectfully asserts that the teachings of Ludwig fail to disclose each and every element of claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that Hawkes fails to remedy the deficiencies of Ludwig in disclosing the discussed limitations of amended claim 1. Thus Ludwig and Hawkes, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every limitation of claim 1 and the differences between the claimed subject matter of claim 1 and the cited art are significant and were non-obvious, at the time the invention was made, to a person having ordinary skill in the art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that claim 1 is non-obvious over the combined teachings of Ludwig and Hawkes. Each of the dependent claims 2-30 properly depend (either directly or indirectly) upon amended independent claim 1 and are deemed to include the same limitations as discussed above with respect to claim 1. Accordingly, at least for the reasons articulated above, claims 2-30 are non-obvious over the combined teachings of Ludwig and Hawkes. Withdrawal of this rejection is therefore respectfully requested

**Conclusion**

For the reasons described above, Applicant respectfully believes the current independent claim, as well as the claims that depend from it, are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that they be passed to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 21, 2010

By: /Raffi Gostanian/  
Raffi Gostanian  
Reg. No. 42,595  
Tel: (972) 849-1310